

46  
No. 3.

8.50  
AN ADDRESS\* 757516

DELIVERED BY

HON. WILLIAM D. KELLEY,

AT GIRARD AVENUE,

ABOVE ELEVENTH ST.

ON OCTOBER 3RD, 1856.

---

Mr. KELLEY was appointed DISTRICT ATTORNEY, for the County of Philadelphia, under JOHN K. KANE, Attorney General of the State of Pennsylvania—appointed by GOVERNOR FRANCIS R. SHUNK. He was afterwards appointed JUDGE OF THE COURT OF QUARTER SESSIONS of the City and County of Philadelphia, by Governor Shunk, which office he now holds.

---

PUBLISHED, AND FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA MORNING TIMES,  
47 SOUTH THIRD STREET.



326.973

K282

ADDRESS OF

HON. WM. D. KELLEY,

AT GIRARD AVENUE.

## CHARACTER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

The Republican party, my friends, is neither sectional nor aggressive. It is the conservative party of the country. It aims to promote the welfare of the whole country by promoting the welfare of all its parts. It plants itself upon the Constitution of the United States as that great instrument was understood by its framers, and construed by Washington, Jefferson, and their great compeers. It addresses itself to the reason and nobler sentiments of the people of the country, and holds to the doctrine that "error may be safely tolerated where truth is left free to combat it." It is the party of peace. It aims to promote peaceful relations between the United States and all other people, and governments. It disavows the piratical doctrines of the Ostend Manifesto, and says that our only power of interfering either with the possessions or the doctrines of other people, or other governments, is by setting before them an example of prosperity and of good government.

I say it accepts the doctrine that "error may be safely tolerated where truth is left free to combat it;" and it gave a remarkable illustration of that fact on the 17th of last month, the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. On that day the Buchanan party of Pennsylvania assembled in Independence Square. I say the "Buchanan party," for I will not so misuse language as to call it the Democratic party. Democracy reverences man as man; Democracy believes not only in the right of man to own himself, but believes it to be the duty of government to protect the poor and the weak, and to secure to every child born into this beautiful world equal chances before the State and in society; and as the men who assembled on that occasion hold adverse doctrines, I will not call them the Democratic party. I say on that day the "Buchanan party," assembled in Independence Square, to the number of 2500 men, or thereabouts, calling themselves a

convention of the eastern counties of Pennsylvania; and my purpose now is to lay before you some assertions and doctrines promulgated on that occasion, from the very spot where stood the expectant listeners on the 4th of July, 1776, when that great instrument, the Charter of Human Rights, was first to be read to the public.

GOV. HERSHELL'S ACCUSATION THAT IT BELIEVES THAT "THE CONSTITUTION IS A LEAGUE WITH HELL" REFUTED.

Among the speakers on that occasion was Gov. Herschel V. Johnson, of Georgia, and I will quote from the report of his speech as I find it in the organ of that party. Standing on that sacred ground, in the midst of the people of Philadelphia, a laboring people, a people who boast and justly boast that their industry has built up this grand city and made it as a manufacturing city the first in the Western World, if not the first in the world at large; a people who read and write, a people who do their own thinking, a people who act according to their own impulses—he said:

"There are men in Philadelphia who are dissatisfied with the Constitution, and tell us that that instrument is 'a league with hell, and a compact with the devil. And it is against these men, and this party—by whatever name, or under whatever banner they are rallied—that we are to battle. Fellow-citizens, I have no patience with the man—I care not where he may reside, whether North or South of Mason and Dixon's line—who, after regarding the war of the Revolution, and the blood poured out in the maintenance of our rights, will hold the vile sentiments of the Republican party."

Suppose, my friends, one of you had gone into the city of Richmond, or into Charleston, S. C., and had uttered so vile a libel as that upon the dominant party of that city, would you have been safe? Would you not have been tarred and feathered, ridden on a rail, handcuffed, and, if your life had been spared, sent away by the next boat, or



the next train of cars? Who is there in Philadelphia that is "dissatisfied with the Constitution?" What man in the Republican ranks ever said that that Constitution was "a league with hell and a compact with the devil?" (Many voices, "none," "none.") No, none. It is a vile slander upon the dominant party of the city of Philadelphia, and the State of Pennsylvania, for the Republicans now are, and were on the 17th of September, the majority party of Pennsylvania. Cries of "yes," "yes," and great applause.)

#### CONTRAST BETWEEN THE TREATMENT OF GOV. JOHNSON, AND MR. UNDERWOOD.

What was the people's treatment of the man who thus libelled the majority of them? Did they even raise a voice against him? Did they hiss him? Did they expel him from the city? Did they soil his garments? No. They entertained him hospitably, and thanked him for coming and honestly telling us what the Buchanan party believe, and he departed in safety.

By the contrast between our treatment of that slanderous-tongued man, and the treatment of Mr. Underwood, in Virginia, of Charles Sumner, in the Senate of the United States, of the poor Irish pedlars of window-blinds in Cheraw, South Carolina—is it not shown that we are the conservative, peace-loving, Union-loving, right-respecting portion of the country and of the community?

#### THE EQUALITY OF THE STATES.

Again, that distinguished gentleman said:

"What do the Republicans say? *What becomes of State equality, according to their platform?* Where does Georgia, where do all the Southern States, stand? *Are they to be treated as equals in this Union?* The Republicans declare that we are not to be so treated. *Is it not written upon their banners that the Southern States are infected with a plague-spot—that they are degraded, and unworthy to go into the territories of the United States?* What is to be the result of this doctrine, if carried into effect? I would that reflecting men would decide the question fairly. Let them think of it at their firesides, and when they lay their heads upon the pillow at night. Let it be known every where, that a party in sixteen States—Northern States—arrogate to themselves the right to elect a President, to take the control of the government, the army and navy, and to instal their miserable representative in the Presidential chair, irrespective of the rights of the fifteen Southern States."

#### THE CHARGE OF INJUSTICE PRONOUNCED SHALL- LOW TWADDLE.

Now, my fellow-citizens, I will venture to say that you cannot find in the same number of lines in the English language so much shallow twaddle and artful misrepresentation, as is embodied in the passage I have just read. Who says that the Southern States are not equals in this confederacy?

Upon what Republican banner, spread here or anywhere, floating to the breeze this night, is it written that "the Southern States are afflicted with a plague-spot?" Why, we recognise state equality, and we insist upon it. Does not this man know that 16 are a majority of 31? And why should not 16 States elect a President—there are but 31 in the Union? Does he not know that 13 millions are more than 6 millions? and there are but about 6 millions of freemen in the South, while there are 13 millions in the 16 free States. Why should not 16 States elect a President—especially the 16 free States, with their 13 millions of people? Does this man ever read the Constitution of the United States?—or is it considered in the South as an "incendiary document," and banished by the law of the land? Does he not know that eight States may constitutionally elect a President? It requires 149 electors to give us a President. New York casts 35 votes; Pennsylvania 27; Ohio, 23; Virginia, 15; Massachusetts, 13; Indiana, 13; Kentucky, 12; Illinois, 11; amounting in all to 149; and those eight States, whenever they may vote in conjunction, will elect a President, though the other twenty-three States should vote in union for another candidate. Whenever that shall take place, though they be but eight States to twenty-three, that President for whom they cast this joint vote, will be installed in the Presidential chair; and if the secessionists and disunionists of the South attempt to prevent his inauguration, the free laboring men of the North will drive them and their slaves into the Gulf of Mexico, or down into Mexico itself. Let them dare to touch the Constitution or the Union!—(Unbounded applause. A voice, "that's the talk.") Aye, that is the talk, my friends. We love the Union, and we would slaughter our brethren, even, if they dared invade it. (Loud cheers, and cries of "good, good.")

#### RIGHTS OF THE SOUTHERN PEOPLE IN THE TERRITORIES.

What does this twaddler wish? Can the States go into the Territories? Why, how will he carry the rolling rivers with him? Who of their slaves shall move the mountains? We do say, as the Creator of the Universe has written all over the Southern country, that they cannot take the States there; but we say that Southern men may go with all their Constitutional rights; they may go and meet us on terms of perfect equality. An American citizen, whether he come from Georgia or from Maine, when he plants his foot in any of the Territories, stands there the equal—not the superior, not the inferior, but the equal—of any and every other man. Into those Territories all citizens can go with all their rights. But when the Virginian steps out of Virginia, he leaves the law of that State behind him and becomes amenable to the law governing the State into which he may go.—

When the citizen of Massachusetts steps out of Massachusetts, he leaves the law of Massachusetts behind him. When he is in Connecticut, or New York, or New Hampshire, or Rhode Island, he is under the law of the State in which he may be.—So with the Southern man; and when the citizen of a southern State goes into a Territory, he leaves the law of his State behind him; it does not attach to him; he cannot carry it beyond the geographical limits of his State. And there is what the South complain of; but they dare not state it in fair terms. Their complaint is that we deny their right to carry into the free Territories that law of their respective States which declares that a man shall be held as property—that law which, good in that State, is bad beyond its limits, because it degrades human nature to the level of the beast, and makes the fair maiden and the growing boy mere cattle, to be sold upon the auction block! (Applause.) That law the Southern men cannot carry into free territories; and there is the cause of their complaints.

## DEFENCE OF FREMONT.

We would instal in the Presidential chair (says this Southern orator,) our "*miserable representative*." Who is he? Who is that "*miserable*" man?

Fellow citizens, you have all read of the humble dignity with which Christopher Columbus appealed first to one and then to another noble or royal personage, for patronage. You all know he asserted that by making a voyage due west from Europe, he could sail to the wealth of the Indies; that it was a straight course from western Europe to the wealth of Asia—the "elder Ind." He made the voyage. He did not reach the East Indies; but he discovered the continent of America; and by reason of his zeal and perseverance, we are here to-night enjoying freedom, and the richest of Heaven's blessings. The "*miserable*" man spoken of, is the one who has realized the dream of Columbus. He is the man who explored, in summer and in winter, mid burning suns and burying snows—the passes of the Rocky Mountains, so that a grand railway may be constructed from the Atlantic to the Pacific: and thus in a voyage of twenty-five days,—ten days by steam over the Atlantic; five days by railroad across the American Continent; ten days again by steam over the Pacific,—the two hundred and fifty millions of people dwelling in Western Europe, are united with the seven hundred and fifty millions dwelling in Asia. What a "*miserable*" man, when he has thus, after centuries, realized the great dream of Columbus, and knit together a thousand million of people in the bonds of commercial and social intercourse! A "*miserable*" man, when he has made America the highway to the commerce of the world? (Tremendous applause.) Why, if he be "*miserable*," then may Heaven send such "*misery*" upon my

head; (renewed applause,) I am willing to suffer, if I can thus bless my country and mankind. (Cheers.) A "*miserable*" man, 43 years of age, with distinction won as a traveller, an explorer, a soldier; the conqueror of California by the sworn testimony of James Buchanan himself; a scholar, the ripest and proudest in the country; a man whose reputation is now shedding a lustre upon the American character, and winning honor for American enterprise and American scholarship throughout the civilized world. Oh, that the South could only furnish us a few such "*miserable* creatures! (Long-continued rapturous applause.)

## THE THREATS OF DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

"I tell you," says this same distinguished orator, "that my deliberate and calm opinion is, that if Fremont is elected President, the day on which his election is announced will close the history of this Union. Allow me to put this simple proposition to you. There are in the Southern States upwards of 3,000,000 slaves, and they are worth, to their owners, \$1,200,000,000. Now, I want you to point me to any country on the face of the earth, if you can, and show me a solitary instance of any people, in any age or clime, who have been so degraded and down-trodden by a Government, as that they would calmly submit to the sacrifice of that amount of property. I tell you it is not in human nature to submit to it."

I have already disposed of the dissolution of the Union. We will take care of that—especially if our candidate be elected. (Applause.) Dissolve the Union? The South dissolve the Union? Why, my friends, this reminds me of an incident that was related to me on a recent visit to the coal region of Pennsylvania. I was shown a shaft three hundred and fifty feet deep, and they told me how the workmen occasionally get rid of a pestiferous man—one whom they do not like, that may have happened to find work in the mine. They gave me also a curious illustration of character. In this shaft the workmen are drawn from the bottom to the earth's surface. When a man becomes troublesome to his fellow-workmen, they watch their opportunity, and when he has occasion to ascend, they hoist him nearly to the top, and then let him hang, refusing to bring him to the earth until they have annoyed and vexed him so that he will quit that place of business. They told me that one man, when they had hoisted him to within a few feet of the level of the earth, and there let him remain, took it at first as a joke. Then, after waiting a while, he became impatient and plead to be lifted. After a while he became angry, and threatened what he would do if not immediately relieved from his predicament. The men at the top of the shaft jeered a little at him—reasoned the case with him—told him he had better



be better-mannered another time. At last, in excess of aggravation he drew from his pocket a large knife, and raising himself to the rope, looked up to the men and said—(remember there was three hundred feet yawning below him)—“Blast your eyes! if you don't raise me ‘I'll cut the rope.’” (Great laughter.) And the act would have been a sane one in comparison with an attempt by the people of the South to dissolve the Union. (“Hear, hear,” and applause.)

#### EFFECT OF DISSOLUTION UPON SLAVE PROPERTY.

Why, my friends, their slaves escape now, although between the slave country and Canada there are fifteen free States, whose people, loyal to the constitution, return the fugitive slaves of the South. Let the Northern States be an independent confederacy, so that the slave, by merely crossing an imaginary line or a narrow river, could escape the claim of his master; and what would slave property be worth in Kentucky, Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, or Missouri? Why, it would melt away from its owner faster than these splendid edifices around me would be consumed under a blazing fire, on a windy, wintry night. Slave property would be of no value to them without the Union.

But, more than that, I tell you that there are among the fugitive slaves of Canada men who would now gladly go into the South and excite servile rebellion, did they not know that the great Northern States would pour in upon them an army to extirpate them. Why, where would the South get an army with which to fight? It requires all her men to keep her servile population in order now. Said a gentleman within the last fortnight: “If Fremont's elected, slavery will not exist in Kentucky and Virginia thirty years; the abolitionists of the North will abolish it.” “I tell you,” said the Southern man with whom he was conversing, “if the Union's dissolved, slavery will not exist five years; it is the North that holds our slaves in check.” Therefore, I say that not only are we prepared to hang the disunionists, but the sensible people of the South will hang them themselves, if they attempt to put their threats into execution. (Loud applause.)

This gentleman says that no people on earth would submit to the sacrifice of property worth \$1,200,000,000. Who asks them to sacrifice it? That is, like his other libel upon the Republicans, false—false in fact, false in theory; a slander carved from the whole cloth. What Republican wishes to interfere with slavery in the States? Such a measure is not in issue; it is not one of the questions of the day. The Republicans, as I have said, are loyal to the Constitution. The only issue is, whether slavery shall be carried into the Territories. We seek not to interfere with it in the States,

but we say that into the Territories it shall not come. (“Hear, hear,” and cheers.) We say that in the States it belongs to the people of the States, and so long as they desire to be cursed by it, they may enjoy (?) that privilege to their hearts' content; but, by the grace of God and the power of freemen's votes, it never shall go into the territories now free. (Enthusiastic cheers.)

#### CONSTITUTIONAL POWER OF CONGRESS OVER THE TERRITORIES.

Proceeding in his speech, Gov. Johnson says:

“The territories of the United States are the common property of all the States; and we have the same right to enjoy them as the Northern States have. Congress is the trustee of it; and if it was purchased by the blood and treasure of all the States, then the South has equal right with the North, and the North with the South. This position is incontrovertible.”

And it is admitted by every sound Republican. There is no dispute about that part of the argument. But mark the deduction from this undisputed proposition.

“On what principle of right and justice, I ask again, can the South be excluded from it? Slavery, with us, is a recognized institution. Slaves are held by us as property, and it does not matter whether you think it right or wrong, for when the States were united together under the Constitution we all abided, and still continue to abide, by that instrument, and it recognized slavery. I do not wish any of my fellow citizens present to concur with me in the abstract question, whether slavery is or is not right—I only ask that the Constitution shall be preserved as it is.”

Our doctrine is that slavery is a State institution; that it can only exist in the States; that, the Territories being free, slavery cannot go into them. In 1819 all the territory north of the Missouri line was dedicated to freedom by a sacred compact. That line stood until, during Pierce's administration, it was removed. That territory is, therefore, free. Now, by virtue of what power can slavery go there? Slavery is not the natural condition of man. You were not born slaves. The people of England, France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Prussia—nay, not to take the civilized part of the world—the people of the Sandwich Islands, the people of Africa, the Hottentots, the savages of our own vast wilderness—are not born slaves; they are all born freemen. Freedom is the natural condition of man. Freedom is the gift of God to man, as his birthright. Before there can be slavery there must be violence. The poor African tribe is conquered; the conquered tribe is enslaved. The kings of England introduced slavery into the American colonies. They made a law tolerating and establishing it, and it only commenced by the establishment of positive law. It only exists in any territory when covered by such positive law. Now, is there any law establishing

slavery in Kansas? I have shown you that it was free in 1819, and that it was solemnly declared (every Southern Senator, as well as every Southern Representative, except thirteen, voting for it) that it should be forever free. How, then, do they get the right to take their slaves there?

#### CONGRESS CANNOT CREATE SLAVERY.

I am a State Rights man. Congress has no power to establish slavery or abolish it. If it can establish it in one place, it can abolish it in another; and that would lead us to a grand central government; it would destroy the sovereignty of the several States; there would no longer be a Union, but there would be a centralized government, and the power at Washington would be as absolute over this country as the power at Paris is over France. Congress can neither establish nor abolish slavery; it has nothing to do with State institutions; its powers are limited by the specific grants made by the States in the Constitution of the United States. If, in the territories, Congress cannot establish it, can any other power? The territories are governed by Congress, when they are rightfully governed. So Washington held; so the elder Adams held; so Jefferson held; so Madison held; so Monroe; so the younger Adams; so Andrew Jackson; so Martin Van Buren; so James K. Polk; so William Henry Harrison; so Zachary Taylor—so all the Presidents have held until the little man—(somewhat less than “the Little Giant”)—who is now disgracing New Hampshire, came into the Presidential chair. If Congress cannot create slavery, can it delegate the power to the legislature of a territory? Nothing in nature can impart a power which it does not possess; nor can any legislative body. What Congress cannot do itself it cannot authorize any of its creatures to do; and the territorial government is but the creation of Congress. Therefore, the local territorial government cannot create slavery. When, then, can it be created? Why, when a State is established and the people adopt a constitution, they may make it either a free State or a slave State; but until it comes to the adoption of a State Constitution slavery cannot be established.

The argument is put to us by these gentlemen from the South, that slavery goes into the Territories by virtue of the United States Constitution; that is, that slavery is national; that it exists wherever the American flag floats. The doctrine has been broached in the United States Courts, that a Southern man, visiting a Northern State, has a right to bring with him his slaves and keep them as long as he stays. When you couple these two doctrines: that slavery goes into the Territories by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, and that, by the requirements of comity between States, the slaveholder may visit the free States and bring with him his slaves; you have realized the law which will authorize Senator

Toombs to “call the muster-roll of his slaves on Bunker Hill;” and you may see gangs of men, women and children chained in the halls that first heard the Declaration of Independence. (Great applause).

#### THE DEMANDS OF THE SOUTH ILLUSTRATED.

I thought that the United States were a free country. I thought that freedom was national. I thought that the one thing my countrymen cherished above all others was freedom—the right to advance in material prosperity, in intellectual development, in moral and religious growth. I never knew before that our country was founded and fashioned solely for the extension and perpetuation of human bondage and human degradation. (Voices, “it was not;” “we won’t let it be so;” and loud applause.)

Let me illustrate this subject—the equality of the South in the territories. Suppose you have been travelling for a day in a stage coach over a rough road, from earlier in the morning than you are in the habit of rising, till late at night. You go into a little roadside tavern, and you and your fellow passengers, after getting such fare as you can to regale yourselves, propose to retire. The landlord takes three of you into a room and says: “I am very sorry that I have not better accommodations; we don’t often have so many at once, and I shall have to ask three of you to lodge in one bed.” During the day you have become pretty sociable with your travelling companions. You shrug your shoulders and say, “Well, it is not the most comfortable thing in the world to sleep three in a bed; but we are weary and we’ll try it. One of your companions begins to undress pretty rapidly, and getting ready to turn in, he says to you, “Which side had I better sleep on?” “Take your choice,” you reply. “But there is a particular reason,” says he, “why you had better decide; it would not be well for me to sleep in the middle, and I will take either the back or the front of the bed, as you please.” “What’s the difference?” say you. “Well, nothing in particular, he replies, “except that I have got the itch very badly, and I had better give it to only one of you.” (Shouts of laughter and applause.) Now, I apprehend that there would not be much of “State equality” between you three, but you would say “In this case the majority had better rule, and you had better take your itch under the bed, or upon a settee.” Or, if he had rolled himself well over the bed, you might not say anything, but you would know that you were excluded from the bed, and must sleep on the hard floor or go without sleep rather than take the itch.

#### THE ONE SIDED EQUALITY OFFERED TO THE NORTH.

Now, gentlemen, that is a thorough illustration of the equality we are asked to enjoy by the South.



The Constitution gives them no such right as that which they claim—to take their slaves into our free Territories. The law of nature gives them no such right; the law of nations give them no such right; the laws of the southern States, (if I except Arkansas, Mississippi, and Florida,) give them no such right, even by modern construction. They have no such right, even under their own State laws, as interpreted by their own judges; for it has been decided time and again, that the master who takes his slave into a free State or country, manumits him, by taking him beyond the law of slavery. Therefore, according to the law of southern States, as well as by the other high standards I have given you, the southern man who takes a slave into Kansas makes a freeman of him. To do that they have a perfect right.

#### NORTHERN FACTORY OPERATIVES CONSIDERED AND CLASSED AS SLAVES.

They say in illustration of their argument: the northern manufacturer may take fifty or a hundred or a thousand hired men and women into the territories; why shall not we take our "servants," (as they call them.) True, an enterprising manufacturer, or miner, or farmer, may take hired people there; but, *does he own them?* Will not the men be able to vote, and outvote him if they disagree with him in opinion? Will they not be citizens? Will not the women go there to become the mothers of freemen and citizens—to be the heads of families? How is it with the slaveholder? He goes there, according to their theory, to *own* these men and women whom he calls his "servants"—to vote for them—to compel them to do his bidding—to put them upon the auction block and sell them—to degrade the free laboring man by enslaving the negro and his posterity. Is there equality in that? (A general response of "no, no.") No, there is not, my friends; and I will show you as I proceed that if you let slavery into the territories, you as effectually exclude the white laboring man, as a travelling companion with the itch would exclude you from sharing a narrow bed with him.

#### CAPITAL AND LABOR.

Remember, my fellow citizens, that this speech of whose doctrines I have given you a few specimens, was made in Independence Square. It was made under the window from which was first read that grand document which asserts that "all men were born equal," and endowed with an inalienable right to liberty. It was made under the shadow of the steeple in which swung that glorious old bell, which was to "proclaim liberty throughout all the land and to all the inhabitants thereof." And hear the infamous doctrine broached to the workmen, the manufacturers, and the mechanics of Philadelphia. Conservative, peace-loving, order-loving, as the people of

Philadelphia are, I wonder that this insult was not growled down by an indignant meeting.

"There is," (says he,) "*a difference of opinion in regard to the question whether it is better for capital to own its labor or to hire it.*"

Do you think it would be better that the capitalist who employs you should own you? ("No, no.") That is the question propounded to Philadelphia workmen: "Whether it is better for capital to own its labor or hire it?" Why, you poor son of Ireland, did you know, when you were flying from the oppression of that land, that you were coming to one in which you might get a benevolent master to own you? You German, who have roamed at least personally free on the banks of the Rhine, did you think that on the banks of our Southern rivers there were men ready to protect you from the ills of life by buying you for five hundred or seven hundred dollars, and owning you and your posterity? They think it a great deal better that capital should own labor than hire it! Pray, will you not go and sell yourselves, my fellow-citizens? (Laughter and applause.) And they ask you to vote for men who think that it would be better for you if they owned you. (A voice: "That's the doctrine.") Aye, that *is* the doctrine; it is the doctrine of the Buchanan party, and the workman who casts a Buchanan vote gives encouragement to the idea that the American laborer is a thing to be owned. (Voices, "Don't be afraid; we won't vote for him.")

"In Pennsylvania" (he continues) "you have determined it one way, while in Georgia we have settled it in another."

And that *other* way is the way they want to settle it in the territories—not the way it is settled in Pennsylvania; and if you are true Pennsylvanians, you will disregard all old party ties, all old party affinities, all the opinions of those with whom you have hitherto associated, and like one man vote that it is better for man to own himself than for any body under Heaven to own him. ("Hear, hear," and tremendous applause.) To vote that way you *must* vote for *Fremont and Dayton*. (Renewed applause, cries of "we will, we will.")

"I do not propose," (he says) "to interfere with your system, nor controvert your decision, and I think it but fair that the South should be allowed the privilege of exercising the same liberty that is inestimable to you—to do as the State desires."

I will show you in a little while that neither the States nor the people, but only a little batch of slave-owners, desire the further recognition of the doctrine that capital should own its labor.

Now, listen to the humane reason which is given why it is better that capital should own its labor. Mark the philanthropy of the thing—dwell upon its humanity—reflect in your homes to-morrow upon the patriotism of the reasons which are here assigned:



"Our staples are of such a character that we cannot hire labor for their production."

In other words, the labor is so dangerous, so full of disease, so disagreeable, that freemen would not do it. Then let it go *undone*. Don't murder people to have it done.

"We cannot hire labor in the cotton field or the rice swamp, or the tobacco plantation. Why? Because the climate is fatal to the constitution of white men."

Do they manumit their white slaves? When, by crossing with the negro and the quadroon, and the woman with but one-eighth, or one-sixteenth, or one-thirty-second part negro blood in her veins, they have begotten a white slave, do they manumit him? Oh no; they send them into the cotton and rice fields, disregarding the unhealthiness of the occupation.

#### THE CONDITION OF THE SLAVE STATES.

But let me show you the shallowness of these arguments. A slave is worth \$1000 or \$1500. They will no more send him into an unhealthy place to work, than they would make a soldier of him to fight the Northern men, for you know it is Gov. Wise's threat that they will send an army of slaves north to subjugate us. Every bullet that you put into a negro, would take \$1000 or \$1500 capital from his owner. They would not send their slaves to where it is going to kill them; it is only gammon. I suppose he thought Northern people are like the great masses of the working people of his own State, (as I shall show you,) unable to read and write, and that therefore they would not examine these arguments, but would believe that what he said was truth and verity.

"You cannot get them," (says he,) "to go there; therefore, unless we own our labor, the land now under cultivation for cotton, tobacco and rice, would lie a barren waste. *Southern people do not ask you to do anything that you do not want to do.* All they ask is that they should be allowed to do as the North does—hire labor when they find it best to do so."

Now, my fellow-citizens, this *eloquent* man tells you that we have written upon our banners that there is a plague-spot in the Southern States. It is nowhere so written upon our banners; but I tell you there *is* a plague-spot in the South, written all over the land; in the impoverishment of the soil; in the dilapidated condition of the homes; in the want of populous towns, and in the appearance of the slave quarters—mere huts and hovels—in which dwell the laboring men and women of the land. There *is* a plague-spot in the South, that has taken away from the slave all heart, and hope, and mind; all that gives proof, by man's action through life, that he is an aspiring, hopeful, and immortal being, a plague-spot that has reduced the slave (whether he be of pure African blood, or the brother or son of his master,) beneath the level of all that is human

There is a plague-spot in the South, from which hundreds of thousands of the natives of the southern States are escaping annually by emigrating to the free northern States. There is a plague-spot there that has reduced the white laboring population—who have no other capital than their own thews and sinews, their own good right arms, their will and their intellect—to a condition almost as impoverished and degraded as the slave. The name of that plague-spot is slavery. They are trying to extend that plague-spot all over those territories, more than equal to the thirty-one States that now make up the American Union; and in the name of humanity, as you love yourselves, as you hope for the happiness of your posterity; as you would do your duty to man and God, I call upon you to join in resisting the spread of that plague-spot by electing John C. Fremont to the Presidency of this Union. (Unbounded applause, and a general response of "we will.")

#### THE DETERIORATION OF THE WHITES.

I shall now give you some extracts from Southern writers and speakers, and some statistics, to illustrate the position which I have just taken. First let me read to you an extract from a paper on "Domestic Manufactures in the South and West," published by Mr. Tarver, of Missouri, in 1847. Mr. Tarver strove to improve the condition of the free whites of the South by introducing manufactures into their midst; and in the course of his essay he writes thus of the free population of the South:

"The free population of the South may be divided into two classes—the slaveholder and the non-slaveholder. I am not aware"—(he was writing in 1847, before the census of 1850 had been taken, which settles the point to which he now alludes)—"I am not aware that the relative numbers of these two classes have ever been ascertained in any of the States, but I am satisfied that the non-slaveholders far outnumber the slaveholders—perhaps by three to one. In the more Southern portion of this region, the non slaveholders possess, generally, but very small means, and the land which they possess is almost universally poor, and so sterile that a scanty subsistence is all that can be derived from its cultivation; and the more fertile soil, being in the possession of the slaveholder, must ever remain out of the power of those who have none."

Think of it, landless men who are looking for free farms and free homes in the West—where slavery is, the whiteman is upon the poor land, and even from that he is being driven.

"This state of things" (he continues) "is a great drawback and bears heavily upon and depresses the moral energies of the poorer classes. \* \* \* The acquisition of a respectable position in the scale of wealth appears so difficult, that they decline the hopeless pursuit, and many of them settle down into habits of idleness, and become the

almost passive subjects of all its consequences. And I lament to say that I have observed of late years that an evident deterioration is taking place in this part of the population, the younger portion of it being less educated, less industrious, and in every point of view less respectable, than their ancestors."

What a comparison with the poor population of the free States! Is it not true that the rising generation in the North is more intelligent, more cultivated, more hopeful, more prosperous, than the generation that preceded it? Are there not more children in our public schools this year than ever before? Were there not more there last year than ever before that? Does not every year show an increase of prosperity among the poor—the rising poor—of the North? Does not the poor free laborer come and put his children into the public schools, so that they come to rank among the educated and cultivated working-men, and merchants, and mechanics—the lawyers, doctors, and professional men of the country? Do they not become such staunch "*Americans*," that sometimes they think their own fathers ought not to have the right to vote, because they are so much more ignorant than their children? (Laughter and applause.) There is an increase of prosperity in the rising generation of the North, while at the South, according to these Southern writers, there is a constant deterioration.

#### LABOR DISHONORED AND DEGRADED AT THE SOUTH.

Gov. Hammond, in an address before the South Carolina Institute, in 1850, speaking of the poor white men of South Carolina, said:

"They obtain a precarious subsistence by occasional jobs, by hunting, by fishing, by plundering fields or folds, and too often by what is in its effects far worse—trading with slaves, and seducing them to plunder for their benefit."

That would not be a very good description of the poor white men of Philadelphia. We say that they earn their living by promoting the wealth of the community; we point to our magnificent buildings, and our vast manufactories; we say that our workmen can make anything from a cambric needle to a locomotive—from the delicate mechanism of the watch to the heavy trip-hammer—and they can make that so skilfully that it may be let down so gently upon a robin's egg, that it shall not crush, but merely crack it; or it may be let down upon tons of heated iron, and level it out into the flat surface to be carved by the shears. We boast of our workmen. We point to our savings banks, and show how many thousands of them are depositors there. We point to our building associations, the stock of which is owned by our workmen. We go into the streets where stand rows of houses, fifteen, seventeen, and twenty feet in front, two and three stories high, with their little yards about

them, and we point to them with pride as the homes of our thrifty laboring man, from which the great men of the next generation are to come. Going from these workshops, and these homes to our common schools, and our high school, and the poor boy, whose father is toiling in the factory, and whose mother is her own cook and chambermaid, is found at the head of his class, working with that energy which characterized John C. Fremont when he was the student of John Robertson, now of Philadelphia. (Great applause.)

Again I quote from a Southern writer. In the January number of 1850 of *De Bow's Review*, is an article on "Manufactures in South Carolina," by J. H. Taylor, of Charleston, S. C.:

"There is" says he "in some quarters, a natural jealousy of the slightest innovation upon established habits, and because an effort has been made to collect the poor and unemployed white population into our new factories, fears have arisen that some evil would grow out of the introduction of such establishments among us.

"Let us, however, look at this matter with candor and calmness, and examine all its bearings, before we determine that the introduction of a profitable industry will endanger our institutions. \* \* \* So long as these poor but industrious people could see no mode of living, except by a degrading operation of work with the negro upon the plantation, they were content to endure life in its most discouraging forms, satisfied they were *above* the slave, though faring often worse than he. \* \* \* \* \*

"The employment of the *white labor* which is now to a great extent contending with absolute want, will enable this part of our population to surround themselves with comforts which poverty now places beyond their reach."

In an address upon the subject of manufactures in South Carolina, delivered in 1851, before the South Carolina Institute, William Gregg, Esq., says:—

"In all other countries, and particularly manufacturing States, labor and capital are assuming an antagonistic position. Here it cannot be the case: capital will be able to control labor, even in manufactures with the whites, for blacks can always be resorted to in case of need."

Are you willing that in all the vast territories of the Union a system of labor shall be introduced, the effect of which will be that whenever the white working men object to working fifteen hours a day, or in any other way oppose the unjust requirements of their employers, blacks can be substituted for them? No, my friends, you are not, and you will resist it.

This same writer continues:

"From the best estimate that I have been able to make, I put down the white people, who ought to work, and who do not, or who are so employed



as to be wholly unproductive to the State, at one hundred and twenty-five thousand. \* \* \* By this it appears that but one-fifth of the present poor whites of our State would be necessary to operate 1,000,000 spindles. \* \* \* I have long been under the impression, and every day's experience has strengthened my convictions, that the evils exist in the wholly neglected condition of this class of persons. Any man who is an observer of things, could hardly pass through our country without being struck with the fact that all the capital, enterprise, and intelligence, is employed in directing slave labor; and the consequence is that a large portion of our poor white people are wholly neglected, and are suffered to while away their existence in a state but one step in advance of the Indian of the forest."

Now listen to the passage which I shall read, and you will perceive what is the condition of the poor white men where slave labor prevails:

"It is only necessary," Mr. Gregg says, "to build a manufacturing village of shanties, in a healthy location, in any part of the State, to have crowds of these people around you seeking employment, at half the compensation given to operatives at the North. It is, indeed, painful to be brought in contact with such ignorance and degradation."

Do you wish to reduce the laboring population of the territories to such "ignorance and degradation?" Do you wish to make it painful for a man with a heart in his breast to pass among the laboring people who are to inhabit all those vast territories? If you do, vote for Buchanan; but if you wish them to be freeman, like yourselves, go it straight and undivided for Fremont and Freedom. (Tremendous cheering.)

In a paper published in 1852, upon the "Industrial Regeneration of the South," advocating manufactures, the Hon. J. H. Lumpkin, of Georgia, says:—

"It is objected that these manufacturing establishments will become the hot-beds of crime. \* \* \* But I am by no means ready to concede that our poor, degraded, half-fed, half-clothed, and ignorant population—without Sabbath Schools or any other kind of instruction, mental or moral, or without any just appreciation of character—will be injured by giving them employment, which will bring them under the oversight of employers who will inspire them with self-respect by taking an interest in their welfare."

Oh, God! that it should require overseers to inspire the laboring men of America with self-respect or hope! Oh, no; the lessons of the school—the free press, to which you are all subscribers—the Church, which is sustained in the free North by the laboring and the rising people—intercourse with society in the social circle, around your own hearthside, with your wives and children and your neighbors around you—are the means which inspire you—not with self-respect, for you have that by nature—but with hope and courage to battle

and overcome the difficulties of this hard world. (Applause.)

The descriptions of the condition of the laboring men of the South I have read, are from Southern speakers and Southern writers. They may be exaggerated; they may be highly colored; they may be false; let me, therefore, turn to some statistics and see whether they contradict or verify these statements.

#### EDUCATION IN THE SLAVE AND FREE STATES.

How many free native people over twenty years of age are there in those States, who can neither read nor write? Mark you, I do not speak of emigrants; I speak of free white people, born on the soil, over twenty years of age. In the North-eastern States combined, there are 2,399,651 free white people, and among that more than two millions of people, there are but 6209 over twenty years of age, born on the soil, that cannot read and write. Now, let us look at the Slave States. In Alabama there are 419,016 people, out of whom 33,613, over twenty years of age, born on the soil, are unable either to read or write. In Arkansas, out of 160,721, there are 16,792 such; in Kentucky, out of 730,012, there are 64,340; in Missouri, out of 515,434, there are 34,420; in Virginia, out of 871,847, there are 75,868; in North Carolina, out of 550,463, there are 73,226; in South Carolina, out of 286,055, there are 15,580; in Georgia, out of 515,120, there are 40,794; in Tennessee, out of 751,193, there are 77,017.

The statistics present the case worse than the orators and writers.

Fellow citizens, I turn to, an article from Mr. Buchanan's Virginia organ—the *Richmond Enquirer*—of August 29, 1856—but one little month ago. The article reads thus:

"Every school and college in the South should teach that *Slave Society is the common, natural, rightful and normal state of society*. Any doctrine short of this contains abolition in the germ, for, if it be not the rightful and natural form of society, it cannot last, and we should prepare for its gradual but ultimate abolition. They should also teach that no other form of society is, in the general, right or expedient."

That is, they should teach that free labor is immoral and inexpedient; that the laboring man, be he where he may, or be his race what it may, ought to be a slave! That is the doctrine, they say, which ought to be taught in every school in every Southern State; that is the doctrine which they would transfer to the territories; that is the doctrine by which they would enslave, not you, but your posterity in the next or the second generation.

The article continues:

"There are exceptional cases, such as desert or mountainous countries, where the small patches of fertile land are inadequate to support a larger family than husband, wife and children—such as

Lapland, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and parts of Arabia—such, also, as new England, and Eastern New York, and Eastern Pennsylvania, which, though admirably adapted for commerce, manufacture and fishing, are little fitted for farming or grazing."

Where do you think that man went to school? Where did he get his geography? Did he ever look into the statistics of the census? Has he ever been out of Virginia? He puts Eastern Pennsylvania, with old Berks, and Lancaster, and Chester, in with Lapland, and Norway, and Sweden, and Arabia. (Laughter.) My friends, Eastern Pennsylvania may challenge comparison with the garden of the world. Why, it is the choice spot—the great grain-growing State of the Union. Last year Pennsylvania raised over eighteen millions of bushels of wheat, and no other State in the Union came within a million and a quarter of bushels of so large a crop. What does this man mean? Is he a lunatic? (Laughter; a voice, "yes, he's a perfect ninny.") Are all the people of the South going mad? It is an old classic adage, that "whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad;" and when I find men ignorant as this one is, holding up the doctrine that my fellow citizens ought to be enslaved because they labor honestly for a living, I think that he has made the whole South mad. (Applause.)

"Free men" (he adds) "are required in the former pursuits—slaves in the latter. Hence, negro slavery is found to be the best form of slavery."

The best form of slavery—not the only form; and I suppose the next best form of slavery is that of the poor people of Pennsylvania, who are living on the soil like that of Lapland, Norway, etc.

"But our schools should also teach" (he continues) "that the slaves should be of a different race or nation from the masters."

That is, I suppose, they should be Irishmen or Germans, or Scotchmen, or Spaniards.

"And the wider the distinction the better, as in such case the slave is less apt to feel degraded, or wish to assert his freedom and equality."

Now, let us look at the logic of this. In the next generation they would not be "of a different race or nation." Suppose they should bring white men from other countries and enslave them, would not their children be of this nation? Why, the besotted fool! he does not comprehend the meaning of language, or catch the glimpse of an idea.

#### FEW SCHOOL-HOUSES AND FEWER BOOKS.

"To teach such doctrines we must have Southern teachers and Southern school books."

They must, for they could find no such teachers in the North, and no writers to prepare them any such books as those. (Applause.) If they want such doctrines taught, they must get their teachers and writers in the South; and they will have

to fish for fools before they can get them even there. (Laughter and applause.)

"It is from the school that public opinion proceeds, and the schools should be set right. No teacher should be employed in a private family or public schools at the South, who is not ready to teach these doctrines. Parents, trustees and visitors should look to this thing."

Well, I hope they will. (Laughter.)

Now, my friends, it is perfectly apparent that the schools at the South are not intended to educate men who are not rich enough to own slaves, for poor men, laboring men, would not swallow such lessons as these. They are regarded (as I have said on a former occasion) as "poor white trash," dangerous to the community, and to be got rid of. That is the position to which Buchananism would degrade the laboring men of Kansas and of the other Territories.

#### THE SOCIAL RELATIONS OF THE SLAVE.

Let us look at the doctrine of "capital owning labor." The laboring man who is owned, comes home from the field, or the workshop, or from the scaffold where he has been building—for among slaves there are smiths, and carpenters, and bricklayers, and stone-masons; they are engaged in all the trades that are followed at the South;—he comes home, after a hard day's work, to greet his wife;—no, not his wife—the woman he loves as his wife—the woman who has borne him children—the woman whom, in his rude way, enslaved as he is, and deprived of property, he cherishes as his wife, but who is not his wife, because slavery does not acknowledge the relation of man and wife. The slave woman may be brought into court to testify against the man she calls her husband, and to whom she has borne a family of children; but he calls her his wife—he loves her as his wife; he cherishes her as the mother of his children, the soother of his woes. He comes home weary from his toil, for his accustomed greeting, and finds that his wife is not there. He waits for her, and she comes not. He goes to the neighboring hut, and he finds sadness upon the faces there; he asks for his wife, and he is told that her master being in debt, the sheriff came and levied an execution upon her, and that she is taken away to be sold to pay the debt of the master—a kind man, a man who would not separate husband and wife, who would not tear parent from children, but who has fallen into debt, and this poor mechanic's wife has been levied upon as a mare, or a cow, to be sold under the sheriff's hammer. Do you think it is better that "capital should own its labor?" ("No, no," and great applause.)

#### CRUELTY AND DEMORALIZATION.

Let me draw you another picture. A fond mother in the morning has left her children in the hut and gone to work in the tobacco factory, or the



cotton-field, or the rice-field, or to attend the looms in the neighborhood of Savannah, where they are making Osnabergs and other coarse cottons to undersell us, because they lie nearer to the cotton field and pay no wages for their labor. She has been in some of the various employments all day, and at night she comes home to greet her young ones that she loves as the bear loves her cubs; she loves them as the only treasure and only joy that a slave-woman may have. Through the day, during the weary hours of unrequited and over-pushed toil, her heart has been cheered by the hope of pleasant dalliance with the children of her bosom in her little hut; and she comes there at night to find it still and cheerless. She tears her hair and cries. She interrogates the inmates of the neighboring hut, and finds them in the same dread despair that has seized upon her soul. She learns that "master," not wishing to increase the number of his laborers, has sold the children during her absence to a slave-driver, who intends to carry them to the cotton or the sugar fields in some other part of the South. Is it better that capital should own its labor? (A general indignant shout of "no, no.") Oh, no, my fellow-citizens, and I implore you, in the name of God and humanity, to lay down party ties and party names, and vote only for Freedom—freedom for yourselves and mankind. (Enthusiastic applause.)

#### EMIGRATION FROM THE SOUTH TO THE NORTH.

I have another set of illustrations to give you, and I now speak not of slaves, but of the free white men of the South. Men love their homes; men love the place of their birth; men love the institutions under which they pass happy childhood, prosperous youth, and enter into a successful career of manhood. There are thirteen millions of northern men from whom emigrants might go, while there are but six millions of free people in the South yet the census of 1850 found 609,371 persons living in the free States who were born in the slave States, while only 206,638 persons born in the free States were living in the slave States. Yes, my fellow citizens, in 1850 there were 609,371 men and women of Southern birth living in the Northern States; they had fled from the blessings of labor owned by capital.

"But," you may say, "they had come to the cities; they had come to engage in commerce; they had come to pursue the arts in Philadelphia, New York, Boston; they had come to find employment in all the various pursuits of our great cities." Let us see, therefore, how many people born in the planting States had emigrated into two States of the North—Indiana and Illinois—in which there are no great cities—in which, you may say, there are no universities—in which the arts have scarcely been developed—in which commerce has scarcely a footing—which are two of the young grazing and grain-growing States of the North. In 1850 there were in those two States 47,026 who had

emigrated from North Carolina; 8,231 from South Carolina; 2,102 from Georgia; 45,037 from Tennessee; 1,730 from Alabama; 777 from Mississippi; 701 from Louisiana; 107 from Texas; 44 from Florida; making the total of those who had left these nine planting States, to go to those two agricultural and grazing States, 105,755. Do these people love the South and her institutions? If they do, why then do they emigrate into the free States? Do the same class of people in the South wish that curse and "plague-spot" extended to the territories? No, my friends, they do not; and in Kentucky, in Virginia, in Maryland, in Delaware, and in Missouri they have Republican tickets, and all that dare vote that way will do so; but they are afraid of being ground into the earth by their lordly and aristocratic neighbors, the slave-owners. Still in five of the slave States there will be Republican Tickets run; and when we shall have elected Fremont and Dayton, we will find that there are scores of thousands—aye, scores of scores of thousands of men in the South who will stand by Fremont, Freedom and the Union, (great applause,) asking only that slavery may be protected in the States, and that the territories may be kept free from that which they feel as a curse upon themselves, their children and their country, (Cheers.)

#### THE OPERATIVE AT THE SOUTH.

From the same class of authorities I have previously quoted, I proceed now to illustrate the subject of wages in these States, to show what they would be in the territories, if the accursed institution of slavery should be carried there.

Mr. Steadman, of Tennessee, in a paper upon the "Extension of Cotton and Wool Factories at the South," says.

"In Lowell, labor is paid the fair compensation of 80 cents a day for men, and \$2 a week for women, besides board, while in Tennessee the average compensation for labor does not exceed 50 cents per day for men, and \$1 25 per week for women."

In a speech made in Congress five or six years since, Mr. T. L. Clingman, of North Carolina, said:

"Our manufacturing establishments"—(that is, the manufacturing establishments of North Carolina)—"can obtain the raw material (cotton) at nearly two cents on the pound cheaper than the New England establishments. Labor is likewise one hundred per cent. cheaper. In the upper parts of the State, the labor of either a *free man* or a slave, including board, clothing, &c., can be obtained for from \$110 to \$120 per annum. It will cost at least twice that sum in New England. The difference in the cost of female labor, whether free or slave, is even greater. As we have now a population of nearly one million, we might advance to a great extent in manufacturing, before we materially increased the wages of labor."

## THE WHIP FOR THE MECHANIC'S BACK.

In an article upon the "Establishment of Manufactures in New Orleans," in *De Bow's Review* for January, 1850, the writer (whose name is not given, but who appears to be a citizen of New Orleans,) says:

"At present, the sources of employment open to females, save in menial offices, are very limited; and an inability to procure suitable occupation is an evil much to be deplored, as tending in its consequences to produce demoralization.

"The superior grades of male labor may be considered such as imply a necessity for education on the part of the employee, while the menial class is generally regarded as of the lowest; and in a slave State, this standard is 'in the lowest depths a lower deep,' from the fact that, by association, it is a reduction of the white servant to the level of their colored fellow-menials."

Mr. Montgomery, in his treatise on the "Cotton Manufactures of the United States Compared with Great Britain," states that "there are several cotton factories in Tennessee, operated entirely by slave labor, there not being a white man in the mill but the superintendent."

Mr. Gregg, from whom I have before quoted, says that "all overseers, who have experience in the matter, give the decided preference to blacks as operatives."

Why do they prefer blacks as operatives? Do they mean to say that they are better mechanics than white men? Do they mean to say that they have more skill, more energy? No; they mean to say that they can whip them more readily; that they will not resist so promptly when the lash is applied to them; that they do not strike for an increase of wages or for the ten hour system. Being slaves, they are abject and obey their master's will. They do not resist their employer as does an independent freeman who is willing to give "a fair day's work for a fair day's wages," but is not willing to be oppressed—to be driven—to be bought and sold like cattle. ("Hear, hear," and applause.)

## LABOR UNREQUITED AND UNREWARDED—SKULKS AND IS UNPROGRESSIVE.

Is superior ingenuity claimed for the land of slaves? I turn to the records of the Patent Office to see what the South has done in the way of inventions. The reports inform us that of 833 patents issued in 1852 to citizens of the United States, only 34, or less than 8 per cent. of the whole, belong to the slave States: in 1853, of 804 issued, 71, or less than 9 per cent., belong to them; and in 1854, of 1,662 issued, 147, or less than 9 per cent., are accredited to them.

No, my friends, it is not for superior ingenuity that slaves are preferred; it is for the reasons I have given you; and if you would have the laborer free in Kansas—free as he is in the northern States—enjoying independence and prosperity—you must apply the means which I have suggested:

maintain freedom there by voting for Freedom and Fremont. (Long-continued applause.)

The author of "The Future of the South," (*De Bow's Review*, vol. 10, page 146) says that "the blacks are equally serviceable in factories as in fields;" and a writer in the *Mississippiian* says:—

## INVENTIVE SKILL OF FREE AND SLAVE LABOR.

"Will not our slaves make tanners? And can they not, when supplied with materials, make peg and other shoes? Cannot our slaves make ploughs harrows, &c.? The New England States cannot make and send us brick and frame houses, and therefore we have learned that our slaves can make and lay bricks, and perform the work of house-joiners and carpenters. In fact, we know that in mechanical pursuits, and manufacturing cotton and woollen goods, they are fine laborers."

And they would be fine companions for free laborers in the territories—would they not? Bah! shame upon such patriotism and such Democracy.

## OPINIONS OF THE FATHERS OF THE REPUBLIC UPON SLAVERY

My friends, the eloquent and chivalrous gentleman from the South, who boldly avowed, in Independence Square, the doctrine which the Buchanan men of the North try to conceal: that the great issue is whether labor in the territories shall be owned or hired—wishing to introduce in his oration a piece of pathos, or patriotism, or eloquence, tried to lug in the names of Washington, Jefferson and Franklin. He might have searched the writings of these men in vain to find a word in favor of slavery; they were all anti-slavery men. He might have traced their lives in vain to point out a single act of any one of them that could be construed into favoring the extension or perpetuation of human bondage. (Applause.) He alluded to the Convention that formed our constitution, and said:

"There were assembled in that convention many of those who had participated actively in the stirring scenes of our Revolution. Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin were there."

Here, again, he was mistaken. Jefferson was not a member of the convention, but was representing our country at the court of France at that time. The immortal Franklin: did he think that, when he first came to Philadelphia from Boston, it would have been well for him if there had been a benevolent man here to own him? ("No, no," and applause.) No; when Benjamin Franklin, a poor boy, came here to work as a journeyman printer he did not believe that it would be well to be owned. He thought it was better that labor should own itself, and hire itself out, as he did in a Philadelphia printing office. (Cheers.)

## FRANKLIN'S TOUCHING ALLUSIONS IN THE CONVENTION.

Gov. Johnson, in his speech, drew an eloquent picture of the controversies and difficulties in that convention, their inability for a time to com-



promise, and their growing fears that they would be obliged to disperse without organizing a Union. He then continues in the following elevated strain:

"The immortal Franklin, with his hair silvered over by the frost of many winters, and a brow upon which wisdom was enstamped—the man who himself was the personation of a noble dignity, arose in his place one morning and made to the convention, substantially the following memorable speech :

"Said he, Mr. President, we have been in session for weeks. We have discovered a contrariety of opinions. We have communed and counselled with each other. We have investigated the history of the past. We have surveyed the map of the present. We have looked into the mould of ancient government. We have looked over Europe, at the governments of ancient Greece and Rome for a model for ours. We have found none. We have failed to harmonize. And is it possible that this grave assemblage, charged with such a momentous mission, shall disperse without meeting the proud and high hopes of the American people? No, Mr. President. In reflecting on the condition of our affairs, there is one idea which strikes my mind with peculiar force. It is this: the Convention has met morning after morning, and adjourned day after day, without having once called on the God of Nations to enlighten our understandings. This we have forgotten. We have neglected to implore the protection and help of Him who, while he knows the fall of a sparrow, is also the Supreme Governor of the universe. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that from this time henceforth, our meetings shall be opened with prayer.

"There was a moral sublimity in that spectacle which defies description. The poet may draw inspiration from the shining glories of the setting sun, or the gorgeous and brilliant hues of the rainbow, but there is no hand that can throw upon the canvas the grandeur of that sublime spectacle.—Franklin's motion prevailed, and morning prayers were offered up to throne of the Almighty. They were heard, and the Constitution under which we live was the response. There it is—purchased with the best blood of our forefathers and consecrated by Christian prayer."

Now, I do not know that all this happened. I do not know that it did not; but I will admit it to be true; and I will go further, and say that it may have been that those prayers, thus suggested by the venerable Franklin, drew upon that Convention the blessings of our Heavenly Father, as his kite drew from the clouds the electric spark, which has finally become the messenger of man—the bearer of his errands of business, of sorrow, or of joy.

#### FRANKLIN'S ACTION IN EMANCIPATION.

But that was not the last time when Benjamin Franklin uttered a public prayer or invited his fellow-citizens to join him in prayer. Three years

thereafter, within less than sixty days of the old man's death, he pronounced in public another prayer. He had called upon the people of Pennsylvania to join him in prayer; he had written out the prayer and had it circulated that they might attach their names to it; and when they had done so, the old man, tottering under the weight of more than fourscore years—sustained by the wisest, the best, the most humane and patriotic people of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, carried that prayer in his hand to the bar of the American Congress. There, before the speaker's chair, stood the venerable man, and with his hair bleached by time—with all the responsibility upon him that fast-approaching dissolution could give—with the fear of God and the love of man dwelling in his heart—with the patriots of that day, young and old, gathered around him upon the floor of Congress, while its lobbies were filled with the men and women of Pennsylvania—he uttered his last public prayer. Had you lived in that day, my fellow-citizens, he would have uttered *your* prayer, and you would have felt it your duty, as it would have been your pride, to have had your name subscribed, and to have felt that that patriot, statesman, and philanthropist was speaking your words when thus surrounded by the great, and the good, and the wise, and the powerful, at the bar of the American Congress. He said :

*"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States :*

"From a persuasion that equal liberty was originally the portion, and is still the birthright, of all men, and influenced by the strong ties of humanity and the principles of their institution, your memorialists conceive themselves bound to use all justifiable endeavors to loosen the bands of slavery, and promote a general enjoyment of the blessings of freedom.

"Under these impressions, they earnestly entreat your serious attention to the subject of slavery; that you will be pleased to countenance the restoration of liberty to those unhappy men who alone, in this land of freedom, are degraded into perpetual bondage, and who, amid the general joy of surrounding freedom, are groaning in servile subjection; that you will devise means for removing this inconsistency from the character of the American people; that you will promote mercy and justice toward this distressed race; that you will step to the very verge of the power vested in you for discouraging every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow men."

#### IN CONCLUSION

Do you say "Amen" to that prayer? (A general response of "Yes," and great applause.) If you do, then remember that to pray well is to labor, and to labor, in this case, is to vote. Go to the polls, in October and in November, with Franklin's prayer in your hearts and on your lips; deposit your vote, and then work and pray, until you shall have given FREEDOM TO THE TERRITORIES.

[Amid the most powerful demonstrations of applause, the speaker retired.]



